



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,138	01/26/2001	La Vaughn F. Watts JR.	M-9501 US	7340

7590 11/20/2003

DAVID L MCCOMBS
HAYNES AND BOONE LLP
901 MAIN STREET
SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202-3789

EXAMINER

PARK, ILWOO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,138

Applicant(s)

WATTS, LA VAUGHN F.

Examiner

Ilwoo Park

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 9/20/2003 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed. Claims 1 and 13 are amended and claims 3 and 16 are canceled.

The following rejections now apply.

2. Claims 1, 2, and 4-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 1, 2, and 4-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watts, Jr. et al., US patent application publication No. US 2003/0188077 A1.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As to claim 1, Watts, Jr. et al teach a mobile computing system comprising:

a personal computer architecture system (PC) [PC 105];

a personal digital assistant architecture system (PDA) [PDA 110];

Art Unit: 2182

a switch [quick switch 125];

a first bus [LPC 250, 251] connecting the PC to the switch and the PDA to the switch, whereby the switch isolates [paragraph 0024] control of the mobile computing system to either the PC or the portable architecture system; and

a communication device [common device: paragraph 0024] connecting the PC and the PDA wherein the PDA or the PC readily is able to interface to the communication device;

a second bus that connects [figs. 1 and 2] the PC to the communication device; and

a third bus that connects [fig. 1] the PDA to the communication device.

5. As to claim 2, Watts, Jr. et al teach a set of peripheral input output devices selectively controllable by either the PC or the PDA system [paragraph 0024].

6. As to claim 4, Watts, Jr. et al teach a second bus that connects the PC to the communication device; and a third bus that connects the PDA, and the set of peripheral input output devices to the communication device, whereby the PC interfaces to the communication device and the set of peripheral input output devices when active, and the PDA interfaces to the communication device and the set of peripheral input output devices when active [paragraphs 0031-0036].

7. As to claims 5 and 6, Watts, Jr. et al teach the PDA is a slave device and the PC is a master device along the third bus [paragraph 0013].

8. As to claims 7 and 8, Watts, Jr. et al teach [fig. 4] the second bus is a peripheral component interconnect (PCI) bus and the third bus is a low pin count (LPC) bus.

Art Unit: 2182

9. As to claims 9 and 11, Watts, Jr. et al teach [fig. 4] the PDA is integrated into a mini PCI card.

10. As to claims 10 and 12, Watts, Jr. et al teach [fig. 4] the PDA is integrated into a PC system board.

11. As to claim 13, Watts, Jr. et al teach a method for providing communication access in a dual PC and PDA computer system comprising:

providing a PC [PC 105], a PDA [PDA 110], and a switch [quick switch 125];

connecting, via a first means [LPC 250, 251], the PC and the PDA to the switch, whereby the switch isolates [paragraph 0024] control of the computer system to either the PC or the PDA;

connecting the PC and the PDA via a communication device [common device: paragraph 0024] wherein the PDA or the PC readily is able to interface to the communication device;

connecting the PC to the communication device via a second means [figs. 1 and 2]; and

connecting the PDA to the communication device via a third means [fig. 1].

12. As to claim 14, Watts, Jr. et al teach providing information from the PDA to the PC when the PC is active [paragraph 0013].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2182

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Policard, US patent No. 6,578,140 in view of Kamijo et al., US patent No. 6,538,880.

As to claim 1, Policard teaches a mobile computing system comprising:

a personal computer architecture system (PC) [master computer 32 in fig. 3 or first system 12 in fig. 4];

a computer architecture system [internet computer 30 in fig. 3 or second system 14 in fig. 4];

a switch [KVM switch 50 in fig. 4];

a first bus [fig. 4] connecting the PC to the switch and the computer architecture system to the switch, whereby the switch isolates [col. 4, lines 49-51] control of the mobile computing system to either the PC or the computer architecture system; and

a communication device [col. 7, lines 9-11] connecting the PC and the computer architecture system wherein the computer architecture system or the PC readily is able to interface to the communication device;

a second bus that connects [fig. 4] the PC to the communication device; and

a third bus that connects [fig. 4] the computer architecture system to the communication device.

However, Policard does not explicitly disclose the computer architecture system is a personal digital assistant (PDA).

Art Unit: 2182

Kamijo et al teach a dual computing system having a communication device controlled by either one of the two architecture systems including a PC and a PDA [col. 4, lines 10-13].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Policard and Kamijo et al because they both teach a dual computing system and the Kamijo et al's teaching of a dual computing system including a PC and a PDA would increase flexibility/portability of the Policard's dual computing system including a PC and a computer architecture system.

15. As to claim 2, Kamijo et al teach a set of peripheral input output devices selectively controllable by either the PC or the PDA system [col. 2, line 58-col. 3, line 40].

16. As to claim 4, Policard teaches a second bus that connects the PC to the communication device; and a third bus that connects the computer architecture system, and the set of peripheral input output devices to the communication device, whereby the PC interfaces to the communication device and the set of peripheral input output devices when active, and the computer architecture system interfaces to the communication device and the set of peripheral input output devices when active [fig. 4; col. 4, lines 57-60].

17. As to claims 5 and 6, Policard teaches the computer architecture system is a slave device and the PC is a master device along the third bus [fig. 3].

18. As to claim 10, Kamijo et al teach the PDA is integrated into a PC system board [fig. 1].

19. As to claim 12, Kamijo et al teach the PDA and a communication device are integrated into a PC system board [fig. 1].

Art Unit: 2182

20. As to claim 13, Policard teaches a method for providing communication access in a dual PC and computer system comprising:

providing a PC [master computer 32 in fig. 3 or first system 12 in fig. 4], a computer system [internet computer 30 in fig. 3 or second system 14 in fig. 4], and a switch [KVM switch 50 in fig. 4];

connecting, via a first means [fig. 4], the PC and the computer system to the switch, whereby the switch isolates [col. 4, lines 49-51] control of the computer system to either the PC or the computer system;

connecting the PC and the computer system via a communication device [col. 7, lines 9-11] wherein the computer system or the PC readily is able to interface to the communication device;

connecting the PC to the communication device via a second means [fig. 4];
and

connecting the computer system to the communication device via a third means [fig. 4].

Kamijo et al teach a dual computing system having a communication device controlled by either one of the two architecture systems including a PC and a PDA [col. 4, lines 10-13].

21. As to claim 14, Kamijo et al teach providing information from the PDA to the PC when the PC is active [col. 5, lines 17-25].

22. As to claim 15, Kamijo et al teach the communication device is a wireless communication technology [col. 5, lines 10-30].

Art Unit: 2182

23. Claims 7-9 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Policard and Kamijo et al as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of well-known art.

As to claims 7 and 8, though Policard and Kamijo et al teach the second bus is a peripheral component interconnect (PCI) bus [Policard: col. 6, line 60-col. 7, line 8] among a plurality of different buses, they do not disclose a low pin count (LPC) bus as the third bus. However, a low pin count (LPC) bus is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a low pin count (LPC) bus as a third bus in order to increase adaptability of Policard and Kamijo et al's board slots.

As to claims 9 and 11, Policard and Kamijo et al do not disclose the PDA is integrated into a mini PCI card. However, a mini PCI bus adapting is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA integrated into a mini PCI card in order to reduce a size of the PDA.

Conclusion

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ilwoo Park whose telephone number is (703) 308-7811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2182

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 4th Floor (Receptionist)


Ilwoo Park

Primary Examiner

November 7, 2003